

Applicants : Neil G. Cousins et al.
Appln. No. : 10/781,257
Page : 8

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application as amended is requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 27-35 are allowed, and that claims 39 and 42 contain allowable subject matter.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) on the basis that "the single motor having a rotatable output member must be shown". The motor 70, output shaft 82 and sprocket 74 are clearly shown in Fig. 2 of the application as filed, such that Applicants do not understand the basis for the objection, and the drawings are believed to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a).

Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Donnelly U.S. Patent No. 5,491,956, and claims 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Donnelly '956 in view of Smith U.S. Patent No. 2,952,371. Claims 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Donnelly '956 in view of Lancaster U.S. Patent No. 4,712,686. Applicants respectfully assert that all of the pending claims, as amended herein, patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claim 36 has been amended to clarify that the rotating output member rotates the first and second stretch rollers without moving the drive member when the disengagable coupling disconnects the rotating output member and the drive member. Claim 36 as filed recites "a drive assembly coupling the rotating output member to the first and second stretch rollers and rotating the first and second stretch rollers upon rotation of the rotating output member", such that the above-identified amendment is not believed to narrow the scope of claim 36, but rather clarifies claim 36 as originally filed. Claim 36 has also been amended to clarify that the drive assembly rotates the first and second stretch rollers with sufficient force to stretch film. This limitation is believed to be implicit in claim 36 as filed, such that the scope of claim 36 is not changed by this amendment.

In contrast, the motor 48a of Donnelly '956 rotates a second wheel 42d when a second clutch 42b is engaged. When the clutch 42b is disengaged, the motor 48a does not rotate the

Applicants : Neil G. Cousins et al.
Appln. No. : 10/781,257
Page : 9


second wheel 42d via a drive assembly. Similarly, motor 48a does not rotate silicone covered wheel 42c via a drive assembly when first clutch assembly 42a is disengaged.

Claims 37-41 depend from claim 36, and are therefore believed to be allowable for those reasons set forth above in connection with claim 36.

Applicants have made a concerted effort to the place the present application in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. In the event there are any remaining informalities, the courtesy of a telephone call to the undersigned attorney would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

2/28/06
Date


Jeffrey S. Kapteyn
Registration No. 41 883
Price, Heneveld, Cooper, DeWitt & Litton, LLP
695 Kenmoor, S.E.
Post Office Box 2567
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501
(616) 949-9610

JSK/cmu